



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,092	11/06/2003	Tatsuo Miyaji	040894-5974	8022
9629 7590 03/13/2007 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			EXAMINER GLEITZ, RYAN M	
			ART UNIT 2852	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/702,092

Applicant(s)

MIYAJI ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan Gleitz

Art Unit

2852

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 19, 21, and 22 rejected under 35 USC 102(b) by Ishihara, Applicant's arguments are persuasive and the rejection is withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-5, 11, and 18-22 rejected under 35 USC 102(b) by Ohashi, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that figure 1 does not show a cover, p. 11. Firstly it is noted that even figure 1 does not show a cover, Ohashi will still anticipate the independent claims because the additional trays (1050) read on a plurality of openable covers. Next, as more relevant to dependent claims, the rectangle shows a manual paper feed portion, which includes a cover. A manual bypass section could not function if it did not open to expose the inside of the machine. Applicant also submits that if the part shown were a cover, it would not be on a front side wall, p. 11. On the contrary, either of the sides shown in figure 1 can be considered a front side. Applicant's arguments regarding claim 11 and sheet feeding direction are not understood.

Regarding claims 1-5, 11, and 18-22 as rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Ohashi, Applicant addresses the rejection as if it builds on the 35 USC 102(b) rejection under Ohashi. Typically, an independent claim will be rejected under 35 USC 102 by reference A and a subsequent dependent claim will be rejected under 35 USC 103 by A in view of B, building on the first rejection. Applicant's boiler plate response to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection, p. 14, would be appropriate in the typical case. However, in this case the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over Ohashi was made independently and does not rely on the 35 USC 102 rejection. This was discussed in the phone interview on 31 January 2007.

Regarding claims 1-5, 11, and 18-22 as rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Ohashi in view of APA, Applicant submits that APA shows covers on the side wall, as opposed to a front wall as claimed, p. 14. However, the wall with covers in figure 22 can still be considered a front wall. Additionally, even if APA did show covers only on a side wall, this is not a requirement, Ohashi still shows a front wall suitable for covers.



DAVID M. GRAY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER